



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 20, 2013

AGENDA

NEW CASE

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center

13-052PP

(Approved 7 – 0)

**Tuller Road & Village Parkway
Preliminary Plat**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, and Joe Budde. City representatives were Terry Foegler, Steve Langworthy, Paul Hammersmith, Gary Gunderman, Dan Phillabaum, Claudia Husak, Justin Goodwin, Jennifer Readler, Alan Perkins, Jonathan Lee, Marie Downie, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the case on tonight's agenda was not eligible as a consent item.

1. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Dublin Village Center

13-052PP

**Tuller Road & Village Parkway
Preliminary Plat**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a preliminary plat of approximately 7 acres of rights-of-way for new public streets and associated infrastructure in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District, located west of Sawmill Road, south of Tuller Road, and east of Village Parkway.

Claudia Husak presented this application and said they are looking at an area within Dublin Village Center, anchored by Tuller Road to the north and Village Parkway to the west and Dublin Center Drive to the east. She said the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and approved the Basic Plan for the Edwards Apartments that was serving as the Basic Plan for the Development Plan and the Site Plan in the Bridge Street District in May. She said the applicant had started the case review by the Administrative Review Team. She said the next step for them is to get the public infrastructure and roadways into the area and that is what is being reviewed with the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Husak showed a slide of the Street Network from the Area Plan that the Commission just recently approved as part of the Community Plan which is scheduled for City Council first reading on Monday night.

Ms. Husak said the plat that is proposed includes several of the streets with John Shields Parkway going east to west from Village Parkway to Sawmill Road as part of this preliminary plat and all the way down

to Riverside Drive in the Bridge Street District Street Network Plan. She said there are several other streets proposed with this plat, two north-south streets and then an additional east-west street.

Ms. Husak said the Edwards Apartment site is being created by these rights-of-way being platted. She said the preliminary plat consists of several pages and within the preliminary plat documents there is a preliminary tree survey and utility information as well. She said some of the proposed streets are remaining nameless and they have proposed a condition that the applicant include street names on the preliminary plat before it gets scheduled for review at City Council.

Ms. Husak said Street A is north to south connecting Tuller Road to the proposed Street C, it has 60 feet of right-of-way to the north, 11 foot travel lanes, parallel parking, a 5-foot tree lawn to the north of John Shields Parkway as well as a 5.5-foot sidewalk. She said on the south side there is 65 feet of right-of-way proposed with the 5-foot tree lawn, 2-foot carriage walk to help with door swings and a 6-foot walk on the southern side.

Ms. Husak said there are similar details for Street B also north to south connecting Tuller Road to Street C, it has 65-feet of right-of-way and on the north side north of John Shields Parkway it has a 5-foot tree lawn, 8-foot walk which was something the Commission wanted to see at the Basic Plan. She said to the south there is again the 5-foot tree lawn, 2-foot carriage walk and a 6-foot walk.

Ms. Husak said that Street C is the east to west street connecting Village Parkway to Dublin Center Drive, it also has 65 feet of right-of-way, 11-foot travel lanes with parallel parking on both sides and 5-foot tree lawn, 2-foot carriage walk to help with door swings and a 6-foot walk. She said a lot of the streets have similar amenities or within the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Husak showed a section drawing the applicant prepared and submitted after the packets were delivered. She explained that the sections were for options for John Shields Parkway. She said the right-of-way for John Shields Parkway is 76-feet and as proposed there are two 11-foot travel lanes, 8-foot parallel parking spaces, a 3-foot carriage walk, a 6-foot tree lawn and a 9.5-foot sidewalk on both sides. She said this is the section that was submitted with the Basic Plan in May.

Ms. Husak said there was a condition at the request of the Commission to include a designated bikeway within the street and have enhanced pedestrian amenities and they have been working with the applicant through several options. She said the preliminary plat requires that streets sections be included within the preliminary plat documents and this is the time where this gets decided and why it is presented to the Commission for review.

Ms. Husak said they have included in the proposed plan the bikeway plan that is also within the Area Plan of the Community Plan, highlighting the existing the multi-use paths within the City, the typical 8-foot bike path intended for all kinds of users. She said the future cycletrack along John Shields Parkway ends into the multi-use path on Village Parkway to provide the connection south toward Sawmill Road. She said staff thought within Dublin Village Center people would be on bikes either in the road or they would park their bikes and walk around and they had a little bit of that discussion at the Basic Plan Review and the Commission wanted to have a designated bikeway within Dublin Village Center.

Ms. Husak said staff supports the preliminary plat documents that shows a 76-foot right-of-way, 11-foot travel lanes, 8-foot cycletrack on the north side, which is the apartment side and is intended to be a two way designated bikeway, with a 6-foot sidewalk, on the south side there is a 10-foot sidewalk, with the carriage walk to help with the door swings and the 6-foot tree lawn on the south.

Ms. Husak said within the preliminary plat documents there is a tree lawn on the north side proposed with a width of 4-feet and they conditioned it to be a 5-foot tree lawn on the approval recommendation.

Ms. Husak said the last page of the additional information street sections that the applicant has provided is being called their preferred choice which is a sharrow essentially with a wider street section for a 14-foot travel lane with the sharrow and all the other dimensions are similar, it is just in this instance the bikes would be in the road and staff felt this did not get to Mr. Hardt's condition of the door swing issue as well as providing a designated bikeway. She said increased pavement width, which is concerning in terms of travel speeds by inviting higher speeds. Ms. Husak said the applicant and the developer's team wanted to discuss this option with the Commission and she pointed out that within the plat the proposed option is B.

Ms. Husak said they are recommending approval of this Preliminary Plat with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the applicant provide street names for proposed Streets A, B and C prior to submitting the preliminary plat for City Council review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the proposed street section for John Shields Parkway to include a 5-foot tree lawn and a 3-foot sidewalk easement for a 6-foot sidewalk prior to submitting the preliminary plat for City Council review; and
- 4) That the subdivision requirement stating rights-of-way lines at street intersection must be connected with a straight line tangent be waived with this proposal.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant was present.

Ben Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, representing the applicant, said that they had met with staff and others regarding how the bikepath is done. He said they also had been working hard on the TIF and development agreement and they hoped that they were close to closure on that. He said that they had met with the Fire Chief and Police Chief about what they feel is the right way to do this. He said that they had also checked about it with MORPC and bikes.org.

Kerry Reeds, MKSK, 452 South Ludlow Alley, Columbus, said to understand why they consider the sharrow to be the best scenario in this case is that, although he appreciated that Dublin is blessed with a multitude of bikeways that traverse the City which serve a wonderful purpose, but that is a different animal as to what he thinks everyone's vision of what this will be. He said this is no longer a suburban feature. He said he thought the intent of the Bridge Street Corridor is to create this very vibrant energetic place with lively sidewalk conditions with retail where there is a high pedestrian volume of traffic. He said he thought that inherently, there is a conflict when bicycles are introduced on a sidewalk. He said when he parked his car either in the Short North, Easton, or German Village, he expected to see people walking on the sidewalk, but not bicycles. He said he appreciated the concerns of a forced lane and eliminating bicycles from vehicular traffic, he thought it was just trading one conflict for another. He said that bicycles are considered vehicles legally and they are required to follow the same laws as a vehicle.

Mr. Reed said at build-out, he did not think cars would be going very fast. He said at Easton or any vibrant busy town center, traffic is crawling. He reiterated that he appreciated the conflict, but he did not think vehicles would be traveling that fast. He said he thought people are much more cognizant of seeing a bicycle on a street because that is where most bicyclists ride. He said that having a wider roadway will accommodate both the bicycles and cars, although it be at low speed, and preserve the sidewalk environment for what it was intended to be, which was for pedestrians. He said that is why they preferred this option.

Mr. Hale said that they discussed this option with the Police and Fire Departments, who said that they could be quoted that that this is clearly their preferred option. He said that the Police Department saw the conflict between the pedestrian and the bicycles as problematic. He said the Fire Department felt like because of what is going on here; that they are going to be bringing hook and ladder trucks to the taller

building, and they like to have wider streets. He said that they said that their clear preference was to have the configuration where a designated, marked bike lane is on each side of the street. Mr. Hale said that when they researched with MORPC and bike.org, they said that this was the preferred option.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that Alan Perkins from the Fire Department was present, but no one was present to represent the Police Department. She asked if staff understood that was the Police Department's clear preference.

Justin Goodwin said that the topic was discussed last week and at today's Administrative Review Team meeting and some of the context of it had to do with how a cycletrack may eventually tie in all the way to Sawmill Road, and what happens if that major roadway, if there is an expectation for bicyclists to be able to continue onto a similar system on a roadway that the City does not control, and that it would not likely provide that system.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that did not sound like Police language to her. She said it sounded like Planning language. She said she was looking for the Police and Fire Department language.

Mr. Goodwin said he could not speak for their positions. He said there was a difference of opinion staff.

Steve Langworthy said that Lt. Steve Farmer, from the Police Department was adamant about keeping bicycles on the street in some way. He did not know that he had a preference for adding three feet or not, but that the preference was on the street versus off the street. Mr. Langworthy recalled that the Fire Department had more concerns about being able to have set up areas for their hook and ladder trucks. He did not recall the Fire Department discussing the bikepaths.

Dan Phillabaum recalled that the Fire Department discussed mainly the benefit of the additional width of the pavement to set up equipment. He said that the 22 feet has generally been acceptable. He said that Lt. Farmer said that bicycles are vehicles, and there was an expectation that that they would travel in the same in the street too.

Mr. Hale said that a very vibrant, lively street scene is wanted, so they have asked in the development agreement, they be allowed to have some use of some of the parking spaces for restaurants, valet drop-off, and outdoor seating. He said he did not know if it would happen on the north side, but they believed that keeping bicycles with a clearly designated lane on the street is the right place for the bicycles to be, not on an expanded sidewalk. Mr. Hale said this is not about money or right-of-way, it is about what is the best way to accommodate all the interests that are here because they are also dealing with how people are going to live and use the sidewalks. He said because of the nature of this development, they think that bicycles should be on the street. Mr. Hale said that they are trying to build a walkable community. He said that people will not be speed biking through what they hope is a congested area. He reiterated that they thought providing a designated place on the street for bicycles is the right thing to do, and they hoped that the Commission agreed with them.

Steve Simonetti, Edwards Communities Development Company, 495 South High Street, Columbus, said that the feedback they received through Stavroff, AMC Theater, and Applebee's, the three substantial existing tenants, was that all preferred keeping the bicycles on the road instead of the sidewalk. He said that they preferred that their customers not be coming in and out on the sidewalk with bike traffic on it. Mr. Simonetti said that it would be their preference that the higher speed traffic of bicycles flow around the development and within the development, either have bicycles on the street if they are going through or have access to a parking space within the development, which made more sense for the retail community. He said that developer has also indicated that the strong preference for any of the potential retail customers within the Dublin Village Center would also be for the bicycle traffic on the road. He said the thought was that widening the lanes would solve that purpose and the interests of what they heard from the Police and Fire Departments, existing and potential future tenants.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application. [There were none.]

Amy Kramb said she did not think last time, any of the Commissioners said they wanted bicycles on the sidewalk. She recalled that they wanted bicycles to have their own dedicated space. She said her opinion was that she did not want bicycles sharing pedestrian space. Ms. Kramb said she did not say last time whether it should be its own bike lane or on the street, but the typical section where they are marked as bike only lanes where they are differentiated from the sidewalk and marked. Ms. Kramb reiterated that she did not want to mix pedestrians and bicycles. She said she was hoping that they could get bicycles their own separate lane.

Ms. Kramb said that this was new to the Commission. She said that usually they approve the general amount of right-of-way, and then they fit in what is needed. She said that the Commissioners are not engineers and they do not know how many feet are needed. She said on one plan, there is a four-foot tree lawn shown which seems small. She reiterated that she wanted dedicated places for pedestrians, for people to ride bicycles and be able to park. Ms. Kramb said she did not care if there is parking on both sides of the street, or just one side.

Ms. Kramb said if they are presented with picking between Options A, B, and C, in front of them, it was a hard choice, she would prefer Option B if they had what looked like a normal sidewalk was actually a dedicated bikepath. She said as it is shown, it looks like a big sidewalk where people might walk or bike on it, and she did not like that approach.

Ms. Kramb referred to Sheet 5 of 7, and noted that the cross section did not match anything. She said she definitely did not like it because it had 10-foot walkways, and 4-foot on the other side.

Ms. Husak said it was essentially, the north and south section, it was just that in the section drawing, they are showing a five-foot tree lawn that Planning has conditioned that they do. She explained that in the section that was reviewed tonight, a four-foot tree lawn is shown.

Ms. Kramb noted that the parallel parking is shown as 7½ feet wide and it was shown as 8 feet on the presentation, the walkway is shown as 10 feet wide.

Ms. Husak confirmed that it was 10 feet and that the parking spaces were 7½ feet wide, with a 6-inch curb.

Ms. Kramb noted that the distributed section showed 2½ feet, and the presentation showed 3 feet. She said she wanted to make sure that they were approving the right thing.

Ms. Husak clarified that the Commission was reviewing the preliminary plat as submitted, and that the street sections distributed tonight were submitted by the applicant as illustrative to the discussion, after the fact.

John Hardt said relative to the overall submitted materials, he recalled from the Basic Plan Review a desire to have sidewalks wider than six feet. He pointed out that the sidewalks were widened only on Street B, north of John Shields Parkway and the rest remained six feet wide.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if all of John Shields Parkway had six-foot sidewalks.

Ms. Husak said they were shown as six-feet on the north side and ten feet on the south side. She said that the street sections in the preliminary plat show a ten-foot sidewalk on the south side and a six-foot sidewalk on the north side of John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Hardt referred to the Street Network diagram from the Bridge Street Code and noted that it showed three significant east/west streets in the Bridge Street Corridor (BSC), John Shields Parkway, Village Parkway, and State Route 161. He said that the Planning Report stated that it was staff's expectation that John Shields Parkway would have bicyclists using the street rather than providing a specific route for them. He recalled when the Commission went through the BSC visioning plan, Code writing and work sessions, they saw photographs showing many ways to accommodate bicycles in an urban environment. He asked if the intent was not to provide some kind of explicit bike provision on John Shields Parkway, then where did they plan on doing that.

Ms. Husak referred to the bikeway plan and said it was on John Shields Parkway, it just went to Village Parkway and then made you go south as a commuter to go through that portion of Dublin to get out to Sawmill Road which is a signalized intersection.

Mr. Langworthy recalled that during their discussions, they discussed that as they came down from that eastbound direction; that the nature and character of what would happen once we cross Village Parkway would change. He said that the idea was that Dublin Village Center, being much more intensely developed than many other parts of the Corridor would take on a different character at some point. Mr. Langworthy said that it would be less inclined to be like the other sections and be more of that urban streetscape.

Mr. Hardt said that he clearly recognized that once you get outside of the BSC, the character of any route is going to change, pedestrian, bicycle, vehicle, or otherwise. He said that the diagram presented is short-sided because if the only way to get to Sawmill Road and beyond is on Village Parkway, the east side Sawmill Road, Village Parkway continues as Federated Boulevard, which goes to the Anderson's and nowhere else, while Snouffer Road to the north continues all the way to the east across the City of Columbus and ultimately connects to the Olentangy Bike Trail. He said he did not know why we would not be encouraging as many connections as possible. Mr. Hardt said he did not expect an answer to that, but it troubled him that they went through all those conversations, and we are inclined to throw up our arms and say it is too hard or we are not sure how to solve the problem, so we are just not going to bother doing it on the first street built.

Mr. Hardt said that when the Commission had this conversation during the Basic Plan Review, it was never his intention that bicycles would be on the sidewalk. He said tonight, the debate has been boiled down to bicycles in the street versus on the sidewalk.

Ms. Husak said it was not on the sidewalk. She said it was a designated cycletrack that is in the street.

Mr. Hardt said not according to the applicant tonight who commented that they did not want bicycles on the sidewalk because it was not conducive to business and they do not feel it was the smart place to put it. He said he did not want them on the sidewalk either. He said conversely, the applicant said better place was to put them in a designated lane for bicyclists, which he could probably agree, but that was not what he saw. He said that sharrows are not a designated lane for bicyclists; they are what is used when there is a street and there no other way to solve the problem and motorists need to be told to watch. Mr. Hardt said he was not inclined to dictate a solution, but what the Commission asked for was a designated place for bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. He said he did not see those problems solved in any of the things presented tonight.

Ms. Husak asked if a pavement marking or sign on the cycletrack would get there, or just the idea of the two-way cycletrack is not what the Commission envisioned.

Ms. Kramb said the Commission was being asked if they wanted a designated place for bicycles and they are saying 'Yes'. She said whether they are pavers, concrete, or it is green, is not what the Commission is

deciding tonight. She said in her opinion, when the Commission approves this amount of right-of-way, there should be a designated place for bicycles, and pedestrians should not be on it.

Mr. Hardt said that when he was in New York City, he went on a 2 hour bike ride in the densest urban area with six others, and they felt absolutely safe because they were on a route that had a cycletrack. He said the cycletrack was at the street elevation.

Ms. Newell said a problem in the interpretation that the cycletrack is a sidewalk is that it is at the same elevation as the sidewalk. She said the conflict exists in Dublin who has beautiful bikepaths that are shared with walking communities. She said she lives on a very narrow street where bicyclists exercising travel at high speeds want to travel at the same speed as the traffic. She said that was a small segment of a number of cyclists in Dublin. She said there are just as many parents who ride with small children who cannot go fast enough to keep up. She said the bikepath has to accommodate all residents, not just particular aspect of it. She said in the street and shared with that is also completely contrary to what was discussed in many of the Planning discussions. She said that narrower streets will reduce the speed of traffic because you have to drive more cautiously. She said at Easton, they are narrower streets with parking on both sides. Ms. Newell said because you have parking and the conflict of pedestrians, drivers tend to drive slower. She said Easton is also a destination, and it is not designed for continual cut through traffic, so it was not a fair comparison on what is being considered. Ms. Newell said she has never been comfortable riding her bicycle in the street. She said she would ride 20 miles on her bicycle if she was given a comfortable place to ride that was not in the street.

Warren Fishman disclosed that he received a phone call from Matt Stavroff who wanted to know exactly what the Commission voted on last time. He said he told Mr. Stavroff that as far as he knew, the Commission voted that they would have an independent, definite bikeway, but they did not say what kind. He said that he told Mr. Stavroff to contact Planning.

Mr. Fishman said what the Commission envisioned is a separate bikeway. He said that a sharrows is not a separate bikeway. He said what he envisioned was a separate bikeway. He said that he did not care what it is, just so it was a place that pedestrians do not walk and vehicles do not drive. Mr. Fishman said that he did not know that the Commission should design the road. He said he thought it was clear that is what all the Commissioners want. He said that sharrows are an afterthought, there so that you do not get injured when bicycling on a heavily travelled street. He pointed out that sharrows are usually ignored by drivers when he rides his bicycle. Mr. Fishman said this discussion was very superfluous. He said the Commission made it clear when they approved the Basic Plan Review that they wanted separate bikeways done the way they want. He said that they did not want sharrows, but something dedicated for bicycles. Mr. Fishman agreed with Mr. Hardt that they were needed throughout the development, not just on one street.

Mr. Hardt said that there were precious few routes to get to the west.

Ms. Newell said that Snouffer Road was very congested on the other side of Sawmill Road. She said that she did not see that changing realistically.

Joe Budde asked what was the projected speed limit of John Shields Parkway from Sawmill Road to Riverside Drive.

Ms. Husak said that inside of Dublin Village Center, it was 25 mph.

Mr. Budde asked if after this development occurs and John Shields Parkway gets developed to Riverside Drive, it would likely remain 25 mph all the way.

Paul Hammersmith said in this sort of business district, Engineering would certainly promote a 25 mph speed limit in this sort of environment, especially when it is a pedestrian-rich environment, with the hope that they would have compliance in the 30 mph range. He said in his view, it was not one to post at 35 mph. He said that we would constantly battling speed.

Mr. Budde said he was a biker and he did not want to be on a sidewalk, but on a street, whether he was on his road bike or hybrid bike. He said there needs to be a dedicated bikeway, not a just sharrows.

Richard Taylor said that the examples cited were retrofits. He said we were starting from scratch, constructing an entirely new road where whatever is wanted can be done. He said clearly, the Commission at the last meeting said that they wanted a designated bikeway and an enhanced pedestrian pathway, so they did not anticipate that the sidewalk and bikeway would be the same. He said he did not know if the bikeway needed to be 8 feet wide. He said to Ms. Newell's point, the types of Dublin bicyclists vary. He said to put bicycling families on the street with vehicles at any speed is not good. Mr. Taylor said that it is hoped that this becomes a vital connection throughout the whole City. He said it is not known what will be to the south of this building, but it is going to be restaurants, shops, open space, and parks which may attract families to this area. He said there may be single parents with small children in the apartments. He said what is important is that as many options are left open as possible going forward and that we make sure that we can accommodate lots of different uses going forward. Mr. Taylor said whatever it takes to make sure that bicycles are accommodated in a safe manner, whether on the road in a designated lane or off the road in a designated lane is not important to him. He said what is important is that we have it.

Ms. Newell noted that only one of the street sections showed pervious pavers which she thought was a wonderful amenity and a great feature and she encouraged more get incorporated.

Mr. Budde said that from the drawings submitted he could not tell where vehicles came off John Shields Parkway to go to the movie theater and parking. He said that on what Ms. Husak presented, he could see it better.

Ms. Husak said that the parking lot north of John Shields Parkway, just north of the theater, is also one of the crosswalk areas that was discussed at the last Commission meeting, that it would be an area that was going to be shown within the street, that it was the designated crosswalk to get from that exit from the theater to that parking area. She said that was one of the conditions as well.

Ms. Kramb said that the Commission would be approving tonight the crosswalks or anything like that, but they are showing parallel parking across from the theater entrance. She said she assumed there was no intention of crossing where the existing doors are located.

Ms. Husak said there will be areas that even though parallel parking can be accommodated that will be striped or marked that there cannot be vehicles parked in it, and that it was a definite crosswalk area.

Mr. Langworthy recalled that a condition previously discussed was to make sure that there was safe crossing between the theater and the parking to the north. He said that staff has been looking at the drive that takes off into the theater area right at the crosswalk in terms of getting that eliminated, turning all of that area into open space or park space, eliminating the drive that comes in so that the crosswalk stays clear.

Mr. Hardt asked if that was the drive on the north side of John Shields Parkway into the parking lot that is to remain.

Ms. Husak said it was the drop-off area, on the south side of John Shields Parkway, just as you are going east, past the theater.

Ms. Amorose Groomes disclosed that Mr. Stavroff had phoned her also. She said that since he was unable to attend the last Commission meeting, he wanted clarification on what her perspective was of what it was that the Commission had voted. She said that the Commission had voted on a condition that said that the bicycles would be intentionally dealt with and whatever that meant, they assumed that it would be subject to staff approval, which was part of a condition. She said that she and Mr. Stavroff had a brief discussion about it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said during her seven years on the Commission, they have never designed a bikepath or bike lane in their meetings. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not sure why they were doing it tonight, because she was likely to take the perspective that if the Fire and Police Departments say the bicycles need to be on the street, and then they need to be on the street. She said she would like it to be safe for bicycles to be on the street, so she did not know that sharrows are appropriate, but the Commission saw things where there were sections of the edge of the street that was painted green and maybe the two bike lanes can be next to each other on the street, maybe they go down the center of the street. She said she did not know because she was not the bicycle expert's. Amorose Groomes said she was completely uncomfortable on voting on anything other than what is going to be the right-of-way. She said what is contained in that right-of-way, she did not know that she was comfortable in dictating what she deemed are life-safety issues that happen within that right-of-way any more than she would want to say where the fire exit should be on a building's.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said for the aesthetic and functionality portions, which is what the Commission is charged with, she would not be willing to accept any tree lawns less than five feet wide or any sidewalks less than eight feet wide. She said if we are trying to make an urban, highly walkable environment with six-foot sidewalks, the battle will be lost in her mind.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with everything Ms. Amorose Groomes said in principle. He asked how they would vote on a right-of-way dimension if they do not know what that dimension has to be to accommodate the design.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the other side of the street has no platting yet, and there could be additional right-of-way that would be dedicated when it gets platted and the right-of-way becomes wider.

Ms. Husak said that was the entire right-of-way for both sides of the street.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if this will govern everything, but the plat is for the piece of property being considered.

Ms. Husak said that the preliminary plat was for all the streets presented on the screen. She said the preliminary plat was for all the rights-of-way.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agreed, but did not know what else to do.

Mr. Fishman said he agreed with all the Commissioners, but he also thought they voted and made very clear that they wanted a dedicated bikeway and dedicated walkway, and so he did not care how that is done, as long as there is not a sharrow. He said this is a new street and sharrows are a last ditch effort to try to allow bicycles in a congested area. Mr. Fishman said he thought the Commission wanted to make it clear that they did not care how that is done. He said he agreed with Mr. Taylor about voting for a width because the Commission does not know what it will take. Mr. Fishman said he agreed that a six-foot sidewalk in a congested area is not going to work. He said this is really simple, the Commission wants a dedicated walkway, dedicated bikeway, and a place for vehicles, and the rest is up to them.

Mr. Langworthy said he thought that was clear to the Administrative Review Team who took a more conservative stand to begin with by doing the cycletrack, because there is also a cycletrack planned on

the other end of John Shields Parkway by the Vrable development. He said in the end, he thought all they really wanted to know from the Commission tonight is if it is on street or off street.

Mr. Fishman said if it was on street, it cannot be a sharrow, it has to have extra width and a definite line. He said in Europe, there were small curbs sticking up to delineate where the bicycles and vehicles go. He said it had to be a delineated bikepath. Mr. Fishman said he did not care if it was on the street.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if 11-foot lanes were needed, that provides 6 extra feet. She said maybe all six feet could be on one side or down the middle.

Ms. Husak said it sounded like a bike lane was being described.

Mr. Fishman said not a bike lane that is shared with vehicles or pedestrians. He said it had to be delineated with a curb or something that vehicles cannot easily cross.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission tonight is not going to dictate what this is going to look like. She said the Commission is telling the applicant the kinds of things that they are thinking that define intentional space for bicycles. She said maybe the Commission did not give enough information when they said wanted the space to be intentional. She said they wanted the space to be very intentional and something that is safe.

Mr. Hammersmith said that they heard it loud and clear – designated bike path versus shared bikepath.

Ms. Newell said that when the Commissioners make comments and ask staff or the presenters tonight to do something, she thought they had the responsibility to at least give them a suggestion. She said she thought they do have a responsibility on the Commission to come up and contribute to that solution, not just say do it, we want it, we do not know what we want. She said when she looked at the design presented tonight on Option B, she thought it had the potential of being close, and she thought there was a hybrid design part way in between. She said putting a curb barrier might not be the right barrier because of trying to take care of storm drainage and debris out of the street, but it might be a rideable gutter or some other designation or change in pavement and an occasional barrier that might keep the separated bike lane from clearly vehicle and pedestrian traffic. She said that she thought there was something close in Option B that would get probably to what she thought the rest of the Commissioners are suggesting.

Mr. Hardt said his comments have been negative, but he wanted to be helpful. He asked if in order to accomplish the dedicated and not shared intent heard from the Commission how much right-of-way did Mr. Hammersmith think was needed.

Mr. Hammersmith said on pavement, it was probably a five to six-foot wide designated area adjacent to the parallel parking spaces and probably thinking forward he would have some concerns about that. He said one was how is the parallel parking going to function because when lining up to adjacent to the vehicle along the curb, you will be out five feet and people are not used to parallel parking that way. He said having a designated striped area, whether it is five or six feet, it keeps the lane width at about 11 feet, which keeps speed down and he had heard that with sharrows, regardless of shared or designated use, where they have added pavement width, that vehicles think that is all their speeds go up accordingly and usually exponentially so that is a concern. Mr. Hammersmith said their challenge is trying to figure out a designated area for bicycles and he did not know that they have completely solved that yet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if Mr. Hammersmith had ever seen bicycle paths go down the middle of the street.

Mr. Hammersmith said that the literature researched indicated that they were always done in the same direction as the flow of traffic and adjacent to the right edge of pavement. He said that door swings also have to be considered and also the turnover of parking spaces in a very rich environment with restaurants and retail shops in trying to get the bicycles and vehicles that coexist. Mr. Hammersmith said this was not a challenge due to the City, it was universal and global in how to best accommodate it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that spoke to the point of that the Commission is certainly not capable of solving that this evening. She said that the Commission understands the tight timeframes and want everyone to be able to go on their merry way. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that as a Commission, they are very excited about this project and looking forward to this District and want it to be right. She said that the Commissioners are not highly-schooled urban planners, but they need some to rely on for their expertise and input on this.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she did not know that the Commission wants to approve any of the options. She said she thought they were comfortable with platting the rights-of-way. She said she understood Mr. Hardt's comment about knowing how they know if they have enough if they do not know what is going in it. She said she supposed it could be replatted in the future to get more space on the far side if they do not have enough. She asked for suggestions on how to do it otherwise. Ms. Amorose Groomes said although she did not know the other Commissioners supported it, but she would like to see all the tree lawns to be five feet or greater, and all sidewalks eight feet or greater.

Mr. Hardt said that she had his support in principle, but he was trying to get comfortable with his question to Mr. Hammersmith that there was enough space, but he did not hear that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was not a lot there and she did not know why they cannot have the flexibility for it to be 78 feet wide or whatever the right number is. She said now is the easiest time to change the width of the plat, but she did not know that is entirely up to the Commission.

Ms. Kramb said she supported Ms. Amorose Groomes on the tree lawns. She said she thought there should be a standard width of the sidewalks, instead of them varying as shown. She said if eight was the magic number; that was fine.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it could be a minimum, in her opinion.

Mr. Fishman referred to Mr. Hammersmith's comment about the difficulty of the putting the bikepath on the street because of vehicle doors, parallel parking, and those kinds of things. He reiterated that he wanted what they wanted, but he also wanted a dedicated bikeway because that is what this is all about. He said if we want this to be young and vibrant as we have been hearing for the last three years, he thought people want to get rid of their cars and want to bicycle.

Mr. Simonetti said with all due respect, the message they read on what was approved was designated bike pathway. He said it was not dedicated and it was not separate. He said they took their lead off of the term designated, not dedicated from the last meeting. He said their thought was that in this downtown area, if you are not comfortable riding on the road, this part of Dublin Village area is not a place, in their opinion, to be riding with your family on bicycles. Mr. Simonetti said their belief is that the cycletrack and the flow of traffic ought to be out and around the hub of Dublin Village to drive the retail community to be what he thought we all want it to be. He said their thought on the east/west connection was that if you are coming up from the river and come to where it dead ends at John Shields Parkway and head right on Tuller Road, instead of going up the middle of John Shields Parkway, if the traffic flow wants to go down to the river and Columbus and go straight across and you are riding that far anyway, the eighth of a mile that you go around that road, around the hub of Dublin Village makes far more sense than having a bicyclist go right through the middle of Dublin Village. He said it did not make sense, and

would not make sense for potential tenants or retail people. He said that is why Dublin is putting a park by the river.

Ms. Newell said she would ride a bike to go shopping because there is not anyplace to get by bike to go shopping to do that right now.

Mr. Simonetti said their suggestion was to get the flow to Dublin Village, and allow bicycles to be parked, not allow it as a through street up and down John Shields Parkway. He said put a wonderful bike parking spot in three or four locations with all of the bikepaths that get you to Dublin Village, and when you get there, walk around and do your shopping, and then go back to your bicycle and head home. He said that was what they were thinking when they were wrestling with the idea.

Mr. Simonetti said if you start to add the numbers with an 8-foot sidewalk, 11 feet and 11 feet for lanes is 22 feet, add another 8 feet and 8 feet for the required parallel parking, add another 3 feet and 3 feet for door swings, add another 5 feet and 5 feet for trees, and then 8 feet and 8 feet for sidewalks and you are at 70 feet on a 65-foot right-of-way everywhere else, you are 5 feet over with what is being suggested on 8 feet and 8 feet on all sides. He said there was some thought behind putting 8 feet on Street B and not putting it on the other side because the other side has not developed and it is not known what kind of an entity is going there and whether or not they are going to need eight or ten feet, there are setback requirements also.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that whatever goes in first, will not be the last store. She said that they cannot design for the store that goes in first.

Mr. Simonetti said that they do have to design what goes into the rights-of-way and what he just described was five feet greater than the right-of-way and it has nothing for a bicycle on it.

Ms. Kramb said the whole point of tonight was that they were coming up with new rights-of-way.

Mr. Simonetti said a right-of-way had been approved which they were trying to design.

Ms. Kramb said she said not say that there had to be parallel parking on both sides.

Mr. Simonetti said that they were following the Code requirements.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if on street parking was required on both sides of the street.

Ms. Husak said that it was required by the Bridge Street Code.

Ms. Kramb asked what were the sidewalk and tree lawn widths required by the Bridge Street Code.

Ms. Husak said that the Code requires the sidewalk to be a minimum of five feet and the tree lawns, a minimum of four feet, although the standard is typically five feet.

Ms. Kramb said that the Commission normally has not designed street sections.

Ms. Husak explained that the street sections are part of this rights-of-way plat.

Ms. Kramb said that this was the first time they have done that.

Ms. Husak said that each preliminary plat the Commission reviews has street sections in it, and this was the first application for a plat in the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Hale said that this is a plat and they meet the Code.

Mr. Fishman said there would be many residents coming out of the 324 unit apartment building who will need someplace to go from the apartment to the bikepaths or where ever they go.

Mr. Hale said the way the site is planned they are less than 100 yards to a bikepath toward the west.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is the difficulty they get into when they do a Bridge Street Corridor Code that is kind of a "one size fits all" for this huge swath of land and this is the uncomfortably that this body expressed explicitly and repeatedly about the process, is that they both lose so much flexibility and they do not have a lot of flexibility of giving them anything else they might want and maintaining they cannot have 5-foot sidewalks in the most dense and urban and active part of the corridor. She said 5-foot sidewalks makes sense in front of the retirement home and in a lot of these areas. She said that she knows everyone present would like to come up with the right answer, including the applicants, of what is going to make this as successful as the possibly can.

Mr. Hale said they have been having meetings with staff and made tremendous progress and have been with Mr. Edwards and have been a big supporter of Bridge Street, because in terms of what it has the opportunity to produce for the City is terrific and goes beyond re-developing a part of town that has had some problems, but it's about providing housing and encouraging businesses to come. He said part of all of that in getting developers to come and do what they have to do to move through this system, Mr. Edwards has spent or on the hook for 1.2 million dollars.

Mr. Taylor said he did not think anybody here would argue that what was created for this district has played a big role in attracting development to this area, it is clear that an area that had nothing going on now has a lot going on and it is wonderful, but does not mean it is perfect.

Mr. Taylor said they have wanted a designated track and do not want the cars and the bikes to mix as directly as got here and would like see a solution to that. He said they are all the time and effort and the money spent on Nelson/Nygard and everyone else and when it comes down to it they are designing the absolute minimum that they can have and it is disappointing. He said the second disappointment is that this applicant sees Dublin Village Center as some kind of walled compound that you stop when you get to and get out and walk through instead of a part of this street network and a couple of blocks in this greater thing. He said that is why at the previous discussion he said "let's not have some kind of an obvious entrance feature that calls out this is the new Dublin Village Center", he said it is not, it is the edge of Dublin.

Mr. Hale said it is clear that within the Dublin Village Center that the conception of the densest part of the Dublin Village Center is this project, it has the widest range of uses. He said it is seen as trying to create a very vibrant center and they are happy to work with staff with the right-of-ways, but the right-of-ways are designed to meet the right-of-way requirements and the sidewalk requirements. He said they have not completely finished with the design of the roads.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not think anyone is suggesting that they turn around and basically what is happening is they are pointing out some of the deficiencies in the Code that they wrote, because they are not professional code writers either. She said she sees a 5-foot sidewalk and they are talk about door swings on cars, let's talk about door swings to stores. She said it could choke down to 2 feet really quick with a 36-inch door opening. She said these sidewalks are presumably going to be right on the building.

Mr. McCauley said they are designing the sidewalks at a minimum it is only within the right-of-way and according to the Stavroff's the sidewalk between the tree lawn on the sidewalk and building face it is 15-feet all day long. He said it is what you can design outside of the right-of-way and if they look outside of

the right-of-way to the front of the building it is not a 5-foot sidewalk, the 5 feet is just what has been dedicated as right-of-way. He said the concern was with one stretch of the apartment on the one side of the road they wanted a wider sidewalk and everywhere else it is guaranteed there will be more than 5 feet of sidewalk.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the unfortunate part of that is that they do not have that information. She said she is just explaining the frustration with the process.

Mr. McCauley said when they came in with the apartments it was said that they were short on one sidewalk and it was done, so when they come back with each section or quadrant or each area they will see the improvement.

Mr. Hardt asked whether Engineering is comfortable that 76 feet of right-of-way is enough and to the applicant's point that is what the rules say they have to provide, so in some respects it better be.

Mr. Hammersmith said he also heard 9 feet on one side for bicycles and a 3-foot carriage lane on the other side of the street and now they would have a street that is off-set in the right-of-way and not in the center and it comes with its own complications.

Ms. Kramb asked if they are being asked to vote on the 76 feet of right-of-way for the roads, so they can plat these roads and are they voting on the typical section as it is shown in the plans.

Ms. Husak answered that they are asked to do both.

Ms. Kramb asked what happens if they want to change a typical section that is in the plan that has been voted on.

Ms. Readler said that it could be conditioned it subject to staff approval.

Ms. Kramb asked how they can vote without approving typical sections, they can vote and give them their right-of-way and they can figure out what they put between those 76 feet.

Mr. Hardt said if they can get comfortable that 76 feet is enough, they can vote on the 76-foot right-of-way in the plat and condition that the roadway section be worked out with staff.

Ms. Readler agreed, and said the condition that exists regarding working with staff to revise the street sections for John Shields Parkway to include the designated bike lane and then the extra easement.

Ms. Husak said she has drafted a condition to get to that point.

Mr. Hardt said he is looking for some comfort level that 76 feet is enough or do they have a bigger problem.

Mr. Hammersmith said Street B is centered in the right-of-way because they have 38-feet, 38-feet with 3-feet that hangs outside of right-of-way.

Mr. Hardt said there is a proposed condition to deal with that.

Ms. Kramb said she would like to recommend a condition that the Street A have the 6-foot sidewalks like everything else does down there, Street A has 5.5 feet and everything else has 6 feet and asked if there is a reason why they cannot add one more foot and make it the same.

Mr. Phillabaum said she is referring to the street on the west side of Edwards, he said it is a 60-foot right-of-way on the north side of John Shields Parkway because there is a overhead power easement, so there is more constrained space in which to get the roadway. He said something else would have to give in that scenario.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the long and short of it is that she believes that the Commission is comfortable with voting on this plat. She said she relies heavily on all of staff to write a Code that they were to approve that was right and if it is not right they need to start right away making those corrections.

Mr. Edwards asked if they want bicycles where they are trying to have retail and if they hope to make this really successful they are looking at a small piece. He said Easton is the most successful development in retail that there has been in the last 20 or 30 years. He said retail cannot have bicycles on the sidewalk with the people if you want it to be successful. He said he supports the Stavroff's in not wanting bicycles on the sidewalk between the retail and the parallel parked cars. He said he is trying to do something that is needed in Dublin and if they put too many restrictions on that do not make the retail work.

Mr. Taylor said this is an apartment building not retail.

Mr. Edwards said there is a third party which is the Stavroff's and they have to make the whole project work.

Mr. Taylor said they are looking at a road and an apartment building right now and they are not seeing any proposals for retail next to it.

Mr. Edwards said they are not going to see it at the same time. He talked about all the work he had done in the past to make Ballantrae a success in Dublin.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the applicant has asked for a 76-foot wide right-of-way on the plat and they are hearing that they can get all the things they want within the 76 feet. She said there are some conditions that they need to entertain and ask the applicant if they agree.

Ms. Amorose Grooms read through the conditions.

Ms. Newell asked for the applicant to explain the difference between dedicated and designated bike path.

Mr. Simonetti said designated means there is something that identifies that it is a bikepath and dedicated means it is nothing but a bikepath.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she does not want them to paint themselves so tightly that they use the term cycletrack because maybe that is not the right thing. She said if the Police and the Fire say it is safe and she is comfortable with that and if it is not safe then she is not and she is not inclined to make condition #5 so narrow that they say that is what they have to do and cause them to generate something that is not safe.

Mr. Taylor said the word dedicated would solve that and nothing else.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they have 76 feet and they want dedicated space for bicycles and they want it to be safe.

Mr. Hardt said they want a 5-foot tree lawns and a minimum of 8-foot sidewalks and acknowledging that the sidewalks do not have to fit within the right-of-way.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the sidewalk does not have to be 8-foot in the right-of-way, if there is 10 feet out of the right-of-way, it can be 5-foot in the right-of-way she is okay with that and that they are wide enough.

Mr. Simonetti said he cannot see how anywhere in here there is not going to be additional sidewalk outside of the right-of-way, so he would prefer they not put a right-of-way stipulation on there that limits their ability to get the other stuff in.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they need to look at what the Code that says the overall sidewalk width must be rather than we have to mandate an 8-foot sidewalk and maybe some of those things need cleaned up and this is exactly what they said would happen once they start getting applications in, it would reveal to them the faults in their Code and that is what this applicant is doing is revealing to them the faults of that and gives them some things to work and improve themselves with.

Ms. Kramb said they need to change designated to dedicated.

Mr. Fishman said he is happy if it is dedicated.

Mr. Simonetti said to make it separately designated because where they put it there will be people walking on it too.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they need to let them work this problem out, the Commission cannot do it here because they do not have the tools.

Mr. Fishman said that is fine.

Ms. Newell said she is not sure the whole Commission knows what they want and the applicants are going to walk away and not know what to do.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they need to have a clear understanding of the general concepts that they are looking for and staff having clear direction for them to work it out. She said the whole process was designed to get the Commission out of the middle of it and if they re-insert themselves in the middle of it, it is not beneficial.

Mr. Langworthy said the only reason to have this discussion at this depth is because of what the condition that was placed on the Basic Plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the condition was very clear, they are having this conversation because the applicant asked them to.

Mr. Langworthy said now the terminology is getting in the way about dedicated vs. designated and he thinks that is the rub they are having right now is it a totally separate facility and he is hearing more on-street.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is clearly in favor of on-street because that is what the Fire Department and the Police Department said was the safest way to do it.

Mr. Budde agreed.

Mr. Fishman said he agrees with that as long as cars do not drive on it.

Ms. Husak said they want a bike lane, a striped separated from the street bike lane would meet that condition.

Mr. Langworthy said after that point if they can get them to the point saying it is a dedicated area off-street, they can properly design it.

Ms. Kramb said they are not saying it has to be off-street they are saying they do not know where it has to be to be safe, they just do not want cars in the same spot. She said it is not a sharrow, it is going to be something else.

Mr. Langworthy said that part they get and understand.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if staff felt like they have enough direction to be able to work with the applicant to resolve this issue.

Ms. Husak asked again whether the street section Option B with the cycletrack as proposed but signed or colored or with pavement markings would it meet what the Commission looking for.

Ms. Kramb said that is close, but if the police says it is not safe then it is not the answer.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they are going to approve 76-foot of right-of-way and in that right-of-way they would like for bikes to be handled intentionally and safely and have 5-foot tree lawns and an overall width of 8-foot minimum of sidewalk on each side that does not all have to be in the right-of-way, but there has to be at least 8 feet of sidewalk.

Mr. Taylor asked that in the future that they help them help the applicant and give them the context of this stuff, it would be help to have or be told what the whole pictures.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if they would have known there was more sidewalk they could have outside of the easement, it would have really changed their perspective.

Mr. Langworthy said they had that in the Basic Plan, but it did not get to that level of discussion.

Ms. Husak modified conditions 3 and added 5 and read them into the record.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant agreed to the modified conditions.

Mr. Simonetti agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved to recommend City Council approve this Preliminary Plat application because it meets the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations, with five conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the applicant provide street names for proposed Streets A, B and C prior to submitting the preliminary plat for City Council review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the proposed street section for John Shields Parkway to include minimum 5-foot wide tree lawns and minimum 8-foot wide sidewalks, and provide additional easements where necessary;
- 4) That the subdivision requirement stating rights-of-way lines at street intersection must be connected with a straight line tangent be waived with this proposal; and
- 5) That the applicant continue to work with staff to design the proposed bicycle facility for John Shields Parkway as a space separately designated to avoid conflicts with pedestrians and

vehicles, and that the street sections be updated accordingly prior to submitting the preliminary plat to City Council.

Mr. Simonetti agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 7 – 0).

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought everyone learned some lessons tonight about the degree of information that would be most helpful to see the whole picture. She said this was not necessarily directed at the applicant, but that we would be more familiar with the Code. She said she trusts the next time the applicant comes to the Commission, things will be a bit easier and that was going to be the goal.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant.

Communications

Ms. Husak said there were no reports from Planning, City Council or Boards.

Commission Roundtable

Mr. Fishman said they really need to look at the Code and review it. He said when the Code was originally developed, they discussed it would continue to change as we gain more experience with new projects and that it would not be set in stone.

Mr. Langworthy said Planning made the same statement at City Council's last meeting and they intend to put together a schedule for when they anticipate reviewing the Code. He said they wanted to complete this project first to help identify areas that may need to be reviewed. He said there had not been a large project reviewed under the Bridge Street District that tested enough Code Sections to provide a good idea of where areas of change may be needed. He said there would be a discussion about what was learned from this case and what was needed.

Mr. Taylor asked if roadway sections were typically something the Commission reviews with plats.

Ms. Husak said that as a Code requirement, preliminary plats contain road sections. She said most of the time the Commission sees them as part of preliminary development plans with a subdivision and the sections included are typical Dublin sections with 28 feet of pavement and a 50-foot right-of-way with a sidewalk on one side and a bike path on the other side.

Mr. Budde asked the distance from Sawmill Road to Village Parkway on John Shields Parkway. Ms. Husak said it was approximately 1,500 feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on July 18, 2013.